

valiant effort of the Chargers. California sent two great teams to the Super Bowl, and I thank the gentleman for his salsa, chips, and guacamole, and give him a T-shirt.

CONGRATULATING TWO GREAT FOOTBALL TEAMS FROM CALIFORNIA

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Chargers and my colleague, all of my colleagues, from San Diego.

We are very proud in California of two great teams.

The gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is a good sport. I waited awhile for him to pay off on this debt. His "the chips are on their way" became like "the check is in the mail." You know, the Super Bowl has been over awhile, and I thought that as to this concession he was waiting for Michael Huffington to concede before he conceded the Super Bowl loss.

In any event, he is a great Californian, a great sport. I thank him for that.

I also will have to say how proud I am of the San Francisco 49ers, owner Eddie DeBartolo, president Carmen Policy, you know, quarterback Steve Young, Jerry Rice, Rickey Waters, and the list goes on and on.

It was a great Super Bowl. We are very proud. Five trips to the Super Bowl for the 49ers, five championships, five world championships.

Go '9ers.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY CONCERNING TAXPAYER-BACKED MEXICAN RESCUE PACKAGE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today with bipartisan cosponsorship, I am introducing a resolution of inquiry concerning the recent U.S. taxpayer-backed Mexican rescue package.

Far too many questions regarding the terms of the financing and the financial risks to our people and our banking system remain unanswered. The purpose of this resolution is to obtain factual information from the Clinton administration on a series of questions contained in the resolution, including the soundness of the collateral backing the agreement, the solvency of PEMEX, the actual terms of the short-, medium-, and long-term loans, and the rate at which funds are being drawn down.

I ask my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution of inquiry and respectfully request the Committee on Banking and Financial Services report it favorably within the 2 weeks required.

VIOLENT CRIMINAL INCARCERATION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 63 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 667.

□ 0917

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 667) to control crime by incarcerating violent criminals, with Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, February 9, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] had been disposed of, and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Four hours and ten minutes remain for consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WATT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 2, Watt No. 2.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATT of North Carolina: Page 17, strike lines 16-23 and page 18, strike lines 1-3.

Page 18, line 4, strike the letter "g" and insert instead the letter "f".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. This should not take 5 minutes. I actually engaged in some degree of debate on this amendment during the period of general debate.

This amendment simply would strike the provisions in the bill having to do with the award of attorneys' fees.

I now realize that I may have the wrong amendment at the desk.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to substitute amendment No. 3, Watt No. 3, and have that one read instead. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment that was originally read be withdrawn and that the Watt amendment No. 3 be substituted.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment has been withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WATT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer my new amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATT of North Carolina: Page 16, strike lines 10-20.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

□ 0920

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment actually relates to the procedure by which an appeal is taken from an order in which relief has been granted in a prison lawsuit.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am uncertain as to what this amendment is. The amendment that was read does not seem to be amendment No. 3 that was printed in the Journal. I would like to understand what amendment we are on at this point.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. The gentleman's side has a copy of them. We redesignated the amendments because when the bill came out of committee it came out in a different form that the amendments that were printed in the RECORD conform with. So we have gone back and conformed the amendments to comply with the actual printed bill.

Does that address the gentleman's concern?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. It does. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I had given the gentleman's side a copy of this amendment and the revised amendments yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, resuming my time, the bill provides that when an order has been entered by the court and the defendants in the case who have already been found to have violated a constitutional right by prison overcrowding or in some other way violating a prisoner's rights and an effort has been made to try to correct that, when the motion to revise that order is made, that order continues in effect during the pendency of the motion to revise the court's order. Well, that is exactly what happens in any lawsuit. If the court ever enters an order in a case, that order stays in effect until the court comes back and changes that order or until some higher court changes that order.

The provisions of this bill would say if the court has entered an order, the order is in effect, the defendant files a